Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/508,658	KROHN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jehanne S. Sitton	1634
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Jehanne S. Sitton</u> .	(3)	
(2) Janet Cord.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>14 April 2005</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: NA		
Claims discussed: NA		
Prior art documents discussed: NA		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE C See Continuation Sheet	SENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	Γ WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation not result in resolution of all issues. A brief su 	on. The examiner will provide a arate record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	plicant/Applicant's Representat	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the specification's reference to a mutation at "K42E" was confusing and inconsistent with the remaining data in the specification. The examiner indicated that the error appeared typographical in nature. The examiner indicated that the specification should be amended to reflect the correct codon. Applicant's attorney indicated that in fact the error was a typographical error which was discovered after the specification was filed. The examiner indicated that a declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 evidencing such would be required for the written record.